

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow are meant to impart precision to the claims, and more particularly point out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-25, 27-42 and 51-67 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23, 25, 27-42 and 51-67 were rejected. Claim 24 was objected to. Claim 42 has been canceled. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-13, 16-17, 19-22, 24, 27, 34-35, 40, 51, 53 and 58 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103**

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-22, 25 and 51-53 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLellan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,649,296; and has rejected claims 2, 6-8, 12, 16-18, 27-29, 33-37, 41-42, 55-57 and 64-65 as being unpatentable over MacLellan in view of Wood, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 5,842,118;

Applicant's independent claims include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the references used by the examiner to reject the independent claims. In particular, none of the references cited by the examiner disclose or suggest the claimed limitations of a single interrogator housing to select one of a plurality of communication paths to transmit a link communication signal to a corresponding one of a plurality of communication stations, which are to radiate a corresponding wireless signal.

As a result of Applicant's claimed invention, the claimed interrogator can selectively limit interrogation to remote communication devices (e.g., RFID transponders) located within a communication range of a communication station selected from a plurality of communication stations.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits Applicant's independent claims are patentable over the references used by the examiner to reject Applicant's independent claims. Applicant's remaining claims depend from at least one of Applicant's independent claims and therefore include the distinguishing limitation of the respective independent claim, and are therefore patentable as well.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been addressed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2638 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 7, 2008

/John P. Ward/

John P. Ward

Reg. No. 40,216

**Customer Number 64494**  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
(650) 328-8500 Telephone  
(650) 328-8508 Facsimile  
wardj@gtlaw.com